

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, it is noted that the PTO-892 form issued by the Examiner appears to have a mistake in the listed foreign prior art. In particular, the PTO-892 mistakenly indicates that the document number for the published Japanese application to Miyama et al. is JP 03-080548. However, it is respectfully submitted that the correct number is JP 03-089548. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner issue another PTO-892 form having the proper document number for Miyama et al. so as to correct the record.

Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph (enablement). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons. In particular, the Examiner's objection appears to be directed to claim *scope* rather than claim enablement with respect to "what the line is". Enablement under § 112 does not require identifying the specific type of line (e.g., "conductive line", "scribe line", "transmission line", etc., as inquired by the Examiner). Nonetheless, the claims have been amended to delete the objected portions (i.e., "distribution constant") so as to obviate the alleged lack of enablement. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph (enablement) be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 13, 14, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mulatti et al. '914 ("Mulatti"). Claims 1 and 13 are independent. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites in pertinent part, “a source electrode connected to the source, wherein said source electrode is separated from an electrode of the n-type well.” Support for this feature can be found, for example, in Figures 2B and 3B of Applicants’ specification which illustrate an exemplary source electrode 127 that is separated from the n-type well electrode 129. In contrast, Mulatti expressly discloses the respective electrodes for source 10 and the n-type well being connected to Vcc through a common electrode.

Similarly, claim 13 recites in pertinent part, “a source electrode connected to the source, wherein said source electrode is separated from an electrode of the p-type well.” Support for this feature can be found, for example, in Figure 7B of Applicants’ specification which illustrates an exemplary source electrode 167 that is separated from the p-type well electrode 169. In contrast, Mulatti expressly discloses the respective electrodes for source 12 and the p-type well being connected to Gnd through a common electrode.

According to one aspect of the present invention, when the high frequency switch is integrated together with other semiconductor circuits into a single semiconductor substrate, the signal leak via the well can be reduced so as to enable a reduction in transmission loss of a high frequency signal.


As anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the claim be disclosed, either expressly or inherently (noting that “inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities”, *Scaltech Inc. v. Retec/Tetra*, 178 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 1999)), in a single prior art reference, *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Commission*, 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986), based on the forgoing, it is submitted that Mulatti does not anticipate claims 1 and 13, nor any claim dependent thereon.

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as claims 1 and 13 are patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also patentable. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are patentable based on their own merits by adding novel and non-obvious features to the combination.

Based on all the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-27 are patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102/103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having fully and completely responded to the Office Action, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY

Ramyar M. Farid
Registration No. 46,692

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000 RMF:MWE
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087
Date: March 17, 2004